DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 422 277 SP 038 064

AUTHOR Clark, Richard W.
TITLE Professional Development Schools: Policy and Financing. A Guide for Policymakers.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, DC.
ISBN ISBN-0-89333-152-X
PUB DATE 1997-00-00
NOTE 43p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1307 New York Ave., NW, Suite 300, Washington, DC 20005-4701 ($7).
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom (055)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Cost Effectiveness; *Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Policy Formation; Preservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development Schools; Program Effectiveness; Teacher Improvement

ABSTRACT

This guide helps advance professional development schools (PDSs) in assisting the simultaneous renewal of teacher education and schools, offering concrete suggestions regarding the financing and policies needed for PDSs. The publication offers information to help people make informed decisions concerning the laws, regulations and finances of PDSs. The following subjects are addressed: (1) What Are Professional Development Schools? (2) What Are the Major Benefits of Professional Development Schools? (3) What Are the Major Problems Facing Professional Development Schools? (4) What Approaches Should Be Taken To Finance PDSs? (5) What Policies Are Needed? (6) Start-up and Operating Costs for Professional Development Schools (offering two model schools); (7) Comparative Costs of Using and Not Using PDSs; and (8) Where Can More Information Be Obtained? (Contains 3 tables and Publications on Professional Development Schools). (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS

POLICY AND FINANCING

ED 422 277

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Imig

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A GUIDE FOR POLICYMAKERS

BY RICHARD W. CLARK

2

Professional Development Schools: Policy and Financing

A Guide for Policymakers

by Richard W. Clark

One Dupont Circle, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-1186

The opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this guide do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the Center for Educational Renewal, and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. The AACTE does not endorse or warrant this information. The AACTE is publishing this document to stimulate discussion, study, and experimentation among educators. The author was encouraged to express his judgment freely. The reader must evaluate this information in light of the unique circumstances of any particular situation and must determine independently the applicability of this information thereto.

Copies of this publication may be ordered from:
AACTE Publications
One Dupont Circle, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-1186
E-mail: nnc@aacte.nche.edu

Single copy: $7

Copyright © 1997 the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Printed in the United States of America
International Standard Book No: 0-89333-152-X

FOREWORD

This guide is offered to help advance professional development schools (PDSes) in assisting the simultaneous renewal of teacher education and schools. We believe that policymakers will find it helpful in learning about professional development schools and the policies needed to help them flourish. We encourage the convening of small discussion groups involving policymakers and K-16 educators. As they converse, participants may want to consider questions such as:

What improvements do we believe are needed in our schools?

What roles should teachers play in making these changes?

What changes need to be made in preservice and inservice education for teachers if schools are to make the needed improvements?

What are the characteristics of a successful PDS?

What role should a PDS play in improving schools and teacher education?

How can we finance a PDS?

What policies are needed to assure development and operation of a successful PDS?

While this publication offers some concrete suggestions regarding the financing and policies

needed for PDSes, we believe that its greatest use may be to stimulate such conversations. We encourage all readers to engage others in dialogue concerning its content.

John I. Goodlād
Center for Educational Renewal
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

David G. Imig
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Washington, D.C.

Arthur E. Wise
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
Washington, D.C.

January 1997

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword *by John I. Goodlad, David G. Imig and Arthur Wise* i

Preface 1

What Are Professional Development Schools? 3

What Are the Major Benefits of Professional Development Schools? 5

What Are the Major Problems Facing Professional Development Schools? 9

What Approaches Should Be Taken to Finance PDSes? 13

What Policies Are Needed? 15

Start-up and Operating Costs for Professional Development Schools 17

- Model 1: Noble Elementary School and Harmony University 19
- Model 2: Bay School District and Northern State University 25

Comparative Costs of Using and Not Using PDSes 33

Where Can More Information Be Obtained? 35

Publications on Professional Development Schools 37

Endnotes 41

PREFACE

Many educators and policymakers from different states report their preference for professional development schools (PDSes) for the practice phases of preservice teacher education. While some states are considering requiring all preservice trainees to participate in a PDS as part of their preparation for their teaching license, Minnesota has passed, but not yet implemented, legislation requiring all new teachers to begin their careers in such settings. As of 1996, there are more than 600 institutions calling themselves professional development schools (or other related names, such as partner school, professional development center, or clinical school). They are at widely different stages of development and, in many instances, have interpreted the concept in different ways. Such schools exist as part of state and local systems of education and are subject to the decisions of many people concerning their role, operation, and financial support.

Elected state officials and their staff, university regents, state and local school board members, members of higher education commissions and state standards boards, chief executive officers of school districts and universities, members of faculty senates, and union leaders are among the people whose decisions set directions for and provide resources to professional development schools.

This publication is intended to help such people make informed decisions concerning the laws, regulations, and finances of professional development schools. For more detailed information about PDSes, the reader is encouraged to consult the resources on page 35. This also is not an analysis of university-based components of teacher education. Although university-based components of teacher education are important and in need of attention from the policy community, this booklet focuses only on that portion of teacher education (preservice and inservice) which occurs in PDSes.

*Terms are defined as follows:

- *students* are those young people enrolled in pre-kindergarten through grade 12 (P-12) schools
- *teachers* are educators employed by school districts (teachers, counselors, librarians, etc.)
- *professors* are employed by institutions of higher education
- *teacher education students* are individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs, including preservice candidates and interns who have already received their initial teaching license
- *reflective inquiry* and *reflective practice* exist when teachers who have a sound knowledge base about the art and science of teaching think about what they are doing as they are doing it

WHAT ARE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS?

Professional development schools are K- 12 schools that have adopted the broader mission of assisting with the learning of educators.

PURPOSES

University- and school-based educators collaborate in these schools to accomplish four purposes:

- Provide an exemplary education for some segment of P-12 students.
- Provide a clinical setting for preservice education.
- Provide professional development for teachers and professors.
- Promote and conduct inquiry that advances knowledge of schooling.

While these four purposes are consistently identified in the literature regarding PDSes, many of those schools formed to date focus on only one or two. Thus far, the second and third of those listed above receive the most explicit program attention.

PROGRAM

Professional development schools emphasize ambitious teaching that encourages student

10

understanding and reflects evolving state and national standards. Also, professional development schools collaborate with teacher education programs that place increasing emphasis on early and continuous field experiences.

Governance

PDSes are governed in a variety of ways. Frequently, a university and a school district enter into a contract specifying activities to occur in the school and defining who has what authority related to those activities. Usually teachers, professors, and school district personnel participate in governance councils and, often, union leaders, parents, and teacher education students are involved.

Finance

In those PDSes formed to date, operating costs for teacher education tend to be paid by the university. Professional development and inquiry costs are shared by the schools and the university, and the costs associated with student learning are paid for by the local school district. Start-up costs are frequently obtained from private or public grants.

WHAT ARE THE MAJOR BENEFITS OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS?

The current model of teacher education and school reform has contributed to a disjointed and confused system. It makes sense, therefore, to develop a new system which will foster improved P-16 learning. The PDS system has inherent benefits because it integrates the use of resources, focuses on core practices of teaching and learning, provides for quality control, contains accountability mechanisms, and offers provisions for reflective inquiry.

AACTE reports that between 1991-92 and 1995-96, the total number of PDSes increased from 123 to 637. During this rapid expansion, considerable differences emerged among these schools. Data are only beginning to be available concerning PDS results. However, there is increasing evidence that when PDSes are competently implemented, they make a real difference for both schoolchildren and teacher education students.

The National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) recently convened a group of professors, state department officials, and school administrators with extensive PDS experience to study this issue. They identified benefits from such schools and circulated this list to educators at 34 colleges and universities across the country. These educators identified several research studies

that supported the study group's assertions (See "Publications on Professional Development Schools," page 35) and did not contradict any of the claimed benefits. Several did affirm that hard, empirical data regarding direct benefits to students and teacher education students remains in short supply.

Drawing from this list, some common beliefs of educators working with PDSes can be stated:

1. P-12 students enrolled in professional development schools perform better than other students on common measures of student learning in basic subjects, such as language arts and mathematics.
2. Teachers prepared in professional development schools are better able to elicit student learning than those assigned to traditional forms of internships.
3. Teachers prepared in professional development schools are more familiar with the practices required in today's schools than those who obtain clinical experiences in other ways.
4. Professional development conducted by professional development schools is more closely integrated with preservice education (and vice versa).
5. Teachers perceive that professional development obtained through a PDS is more valuable than that obtained in traditional ways.
6. Administrators report that they prefer to hire teachers whose clinical training occurred at a professional development school.
7. Teacher associations believe professional development schools contribute to the enhancement of the profession.
8. Universities benefit from teachers who are trained in professional development schools because such teachers help prepare students to perform more successfully at the university level.
9. Universities benefit from professional development schools because they generate tuition and fees in connection with

the preservice and professional development coursework completed in the PDS.

10. Local school districts benefit from professional development schools because they reduce recruiting costs, retraining costs, legal fees (better teachers mean fewer costs for firing teachers), and professional development needs.
11. Local school districts benefit from professional development schools because they are useful sources of research information concerning the quality of new programs.
12. Teachers working in PDSes are more likely to pursue graduate study to enhance their skills as teachers and teacher mentors.
13. P-12 students in PDSes have increased hours of adult attention in comparison to similar students in other schools.
14. Teachers in PDSes exhibit more reflective practice than teachers in other schools.
15. New teachers prepared through PDSes exhibit more reflective practice than teachers prepared via other kinds of clinical experiences.
16. New teachers prepared through PDSes assume leadership roles among their peers more quickly than teachers prepared in other ways.
17. Universities typically view themselves as having a substantial responsibility to the community. Service to P-12 schools discharges part of such responsibility.
18. Better teachers make better schools. PDSes help businesses secure better workers because P-12 students are better educated by teachers prepared in professional development schools. •

WHAT ARE THE MAJOR PROBLEMS FACING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS?

To quote from one observer, "The idea behind professional development schools and the rhetoric for them initially receives strong support from both the university and the school district. The problems come during implementation, when the realities of shared resources, changed relationships, and territorial issues dominate the discussion."[1]

VISION

Many of the early professional development schools have struggled to develop a clear vision which is shared by school- and university-based educators. Teachers believe their responsibility is to their students; professors to their teacher education students, rather than both assuming responsibility for all learners in the school.

The lack of a clear message from the policy community regarding the school's responsibility for teacher education and the university's responsibility related to the education of P-12 students may contribute to this problem.

SHARED RESOURCES

The usual conflicts arise within schools and universities regarding what efforts receive priority

when limited resources are distributed. However, the sharing of resources entails two complex bureaucracies adjusting to each other's way of budgeting, spending, and accounting for funds. Details of how public school teachers should be paid when they teach university students or what reimbursements should be made to professors for expenses related to their work with the school are examples of such concerns.

Changed Relationships and Territorial Issues

Schools and universities have very different cultures. School people typically do not understand the pressures on university people in regard to promotion. University faculty tend to work more individually, less as part of a team. They value reflection and maintain schedules that are designed to support their continuing study and research. School people, on the other hand, value action and keep schedules that leave little time for reflection.

Teachers' contacts with professors are much like parents' contacts with teachers. They remember their first and last classes and may either like or resent the people in the role based on unique recollections of prior experiences. Professors, like teachers with parents, occasionally approach teachers as if they were still their students.

Since developing collegial working relationships is difficult, a new PDS has to be carefully nurtured over time to be truly effective.

Problems exist in this area for university-based educators. Most junior faculty report that their work in professional development schools is not valued when they seek tenure and promotion. Professors in education and in the arts and sciences who focus on teacher education do not tend to be accorded the same status as those doing other kinds of work in their colleges and departments. As the 1996 report of the National Commission on Teaching & America's Future notes, teacher education his-

torically has been a cash cow in many institutions of higher education, and program changes that affect that condition are viewed negatively by university administrations.

School-based educators also deal with a host of concerns. Too often, teacher education and professional development responsibilities are not integrated into the basic jobs of school-based educators. When these responsibilities become an add-on, they create problems for already highly burdened professionals. This problem may be related to one which some school administrators have with local board and community members who cannot see teacher education and professional development as legitimate responsibilities for P-12 schools. Nationally, the NEA and AFT have both been strong supporters of PDSes. However, some local union leaders perceive that large numbers of teacher education students added to schools adversely affect employment opportunities for their own members.

Both P-12 and university educators report that they do not have sufficient time in their current schedules for the heavy collaborative planning and evaluation work needed to develop and operate a good professional development school.

WHAT APPROACHES SHOULD BE TAKEN TO FINANCE PDSES?

Successful professional development schools make use of one or more of the following four approaches to financing their operation:

APPROACH 1:

Eliminate old programs and implement new ones. PDSes affiliated with the University of Connecticut, Louisville University, and Brigham Young University are among those which have successfully sunsetted old programs and redirected money to PDSes. Places which attempt to run traditional programs and PDSes find it difficult to fund the new program.

APPROACH 2:

Collaboratively commit to shared funding from K-12 and higher education. The University of Southern Maine and the Gorham, Maine, schools, the University of New Mexico and the Albuquerque schools, and the University of Hawaii and the Department of Education in Hawaii are among the diverse locales where the K-12 system and a university share in the developmental and operational costs of PDSes. Without such sharing, the financial load is too heavy.

Approach 3:

Obtain substantial external funding. While this solution is not likely to work for extended operations of a PDS, it has proven helpful for many during the initial start-up phase. The University of Texas at El Paso has garnered funding from The Pew Charitable Trusts, the National Science Foundation, and the Texas Education Agency. West Virginia University secured more than $3 million from the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation. The Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal, involving six universities and seven school districts, secured major financial support from Eisenhower grants and state Goals 2000 funding.

Approach 4:

Adopt an entrepreneurial approach. Leaders in many successful settings combine the first three approaches and add creative twists of their own to discover sources of funding. For example, Northglenn High School, working with the University of Colorado at Denver (UCD), has obtained some of its school district's sabbatical funds. With support from the union and the district, it hired seven interns at reduced salary; acquired grant funding; obtained school district professional development funds; found ways to locate university courses on its campus; and placed one of its faculty members as a visiting scholar at the university. Goldrick Elementary in Denver, also working with UCD, has made use of interns and obtained AmeriCorps funds to support some of the preservice candidates with which it works.

Two more detailed examples of PDS financing can be found on pages 22-24 and 28-31. These financial approaches can only work in a supportive policy environment.

WHAT POLICIES ARE NEEDED?

To ensure the establishment of PDSes and finance their operations, the following policy actions should be taken.

POLICIES FOR PDS ESTABLISHMENT

- State policymakers should adopt laws and regulations which require teacher education programs to include experiences in professional development schools. This may be done by attaching a requirement for such experiences to certification requirements, administrative approval of university programs, or both.
- State policymakers should adopt laws and regulations which identify teacher education and professional development as a basic responsibility of school districts and universities. This may be done by adopting requirements for collaborative planning, indicating that a portion of the funding allocated to both kinds of institutions are earmarked for teacher education, and/or establishing accreditation or program approval standards that must be satisfied by both kinds of institutions.

- Higher education policymakers should adopt policies which recognize the work of university professors in professional development schools as contributing toward meeting standards for promotion and tenure.
- State policymakers should consider adopting laws and regulations which encourage the placement of first-year teachers in PDSes. By making beginning teachers a part of a team which also includes master teachers and teacher education students, an improved process of entry into the profession could be developed.

POLICIES FOR PDS SUPPORT

- State policymakers need to allocate funds for the development of sufficient professional development schools to assure that all new teachers can be served. A recent NNER study suggests that, in addition to funds otherwise available, approximately $50,000 per year will be needed by each PDS for a minimum of two years developmental efforts (See Table 1 on page 18.)[2]
- State policymakers should make it clear that money allocated to school districts and universities is to be used to provide support to PDSes. In some states this may require additional funds; in others, it may mean providing direction on how existing funding is to be used. In general, once PDSes have been initiated, it should be possible to operate them for approximately the same amount as is currently spent by schools and universities on teacher education and professional development, educational inquiry, and renewal of P-12 education.
- School district and university policymakers need to allocate funds to ensure sufficient time for collaborative planning by key individuals involved, representing both partners in the PDS. This may take the form of extended contracts and/or provision of additional staffing that will allow planning to be incorporated into the participants' daily work.

Start-up and Operating Costs for Professional Development Schools

Here are further details concerning both start-up and operating costs of PDSes.

Sample Cost Analysis for PDS Start-up

A review of reports of start-up costs suggests that a typical expenditure of $50,000 might be distributed as shown in Table 1 on page 18.

Of course, in an ideal situation, such expenditures would be shared equally between school and university partners. However, our data suggests that universities, helped by grants from private and public agencies, have been the primary source of start-up costs. Since there has also been a tendency to emphasize the preservice function of PDSes, the tendency toward university financing is not surprising. Many professional development schools have obtained small grants to assist with start-up costs. Such grants have ranged from a few dollars to the $3.4 million received by West Virginia University from the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation.

In the first model which follows, the start-up costs are equally divided because the model reflects a commitment to all four purposes espoused for PDSes (see page 3).

TABLE 1

START-UP COSTS FOR A TYPICAL ELEMENTARY PDS

Coordination of Project	
Equivalent of costs of 1/4-time staff member shared by the university and the school	$10,000
Planning	
Workshops/Meetings	11,500
Visits to PDSes	5,000
Reading Materials	1,000
Consultants	4,000
Technology	
Computer Set-ups/Phone	10,000
Furnishings	
Desks and Tables, e.g.	3,000
Legal Reviews	500
Space (Capital)	5,000
Total:	$50,000

To demonstrate the way costs may be distributed in a reasonable PDS, data has been examined from 18 elementary schools within NNER and two reasonable models prepared. The purpose of these models is to provide a starting point for people involved with issues related to financing their own professional development schools.

Each model consists of a short description of the characteristics of the PDS and a table identifying major costs.

Model 1: Noble Elementary School and Harmony University

Noble Elementary School enrolls 500 elementary students in kindergarten through grade five. Twenty general classrooms are used for these students, with special needs students served mostly in general classrooms.

Preservice Program

Harmony University prepares students to teach with a four-year undergraduate preservice program. Frequently, students take more than four years to complete the program because they are required to pursue an academic major outside of education, as well as their professional education sequence for certification.

Of the professional credits required for undergraduates to receive teacher certification when they earn their B.A., 45 semester hours are completed at Noble. At any given time in the PDS, 20 preservice students are participating for two semesters in methods/theory/lab blocks. Thirty semester hours are devoted to this activity by each student. There are also 10 students per semester (20 per year) in student teaching internships at the school. Each student earns 15 credit hours for student teaching. Thus, during the year there are always 30 students at Noble. These students generate 900 semester hours of university credit for the year.(3)

Staff Development/Inquiry/School Renewal Activities During the Year

Ongoing workshops are offered for cooperating teachers. Six full days during the year are allocated for 20 teachers at Noble. Several of the regular teachers are not active participants in the PDS work, but these are replaced by several special needs teachers.

A seminar, "The Teacher as Researcher," is conducted at the school. Six faculty members meet with a university professor twice a month for three hours each session.

A variety of staff development workshops are offered sometimes in conjunction with preservice methods/theory courses. Attention is given to matters such as cooperative learning, student assessment, and uses of technology. An additional workshop is offered which averages five weeks in length and involves four to five teachers from the PDS and 15 from other schools in Noble's district.

During the summer, 10 Noble staff members work for 10 days with assistance from university faculty on summer curriculum development. Also during the summer, faculty from Noble work with a Harmony professor to provide leadership for summer inquiry projects conducted by teachers from other elementary schools in their district.

Within the school this year, two research projects are being undertaken by university faculty concerning elementary student learning and teacher education student learning.

While the district continues to emphasize school-based renewal, the Noble faculty provides support and facilitation linking renewal activities in other schools with those in their PDS.

Four university faculty members participate in three selected study sessions with faculty from Noble and other schools in the district during the year. The first examines issues related to tracking and grouping practices; the second focuses on issues related to inclusion of special needs students in regular classrooms; and the third redefines methods course instruction so it is of increased effectiveness for preservice and inservice teachers.

Table 2 on pages 22 and 23 reports costs of these activities.

Many of the PDSes reporting to us realize that there is a need for an ongoing examination of the purpose and work of the school. This is most evident in looking at ongoing costs of staff development, but to some extent it is the reason such schools need commitments of extensive amounts of time for school and university faculty. Like most operations in education, PDSes are labor-intensive institutions. Thus, whether preservice

or other functions are examined, labor costs represent the largest portion.

Harmony University spends approximately $103,000 a year for the equivalent of 30 full-time students. This represents a cost to the university of $3,433 per student. No tuition is realized from staff development courses.

The second model differs from the first in that it more closely represents an operating PDS arrangement and represents a program in which most preservice education is concentrated in a single, postgraduate year.

Model 2: Bay School District and Northern State University

Bay is a school district with 163 educators serving approximately 2,000 students in kindergarten through grade 12 in its six schools. As such, it is similar to the average school district in the nation.[4]

Preservice (A Fifth-Year Program)

Northern began developing its current teacher preparation program when one of its professors and the dean of the college of education approached six local superintendents about the creation of a school-university partnership modeled after those described by John I. Goodlad in *A Place Called School* (1984). For several years thereafter, faculty at Northern and at schools in districts such as Bay participated in intensive and thoughtful dialogue about school renewal and the needs of the college of education for reforming its efforts. Subsequently, the partners evolved a new teacher education program built on common understandings between school and university faculty members.

At the heart of Northern's efforts to prepare teachers is its field-based, fifth-year program. Students enrolled in this phase of the program earn 33 graduate credits. University officials note that this approach allows them to obtain higher tuition than if the students were undergraduates.

TABLE 2

COSTS FOR NOBLE ELEMENTARY AND HARMONY UNIVERSITY[a]

Cost Item	Paid by School Dist.	Paid by Univ.[b]
1. Preservice FTE[c]		
Regular Faculty		$46,000 (1.0 FTE)
Adjunct/Clinical/ Coordinator	$23,000* (.5 FTE)	
Stipends/Awards (20 @ $400/student)	$8,000*	
Clerical	$2,250* (.15 FTE)	
Related Activities		
Travel	$150*	$300
Cohort Team-Building (w/faculty)	$200*	$800
Admissions to PDS	N/A	N/A
2. Prof. Development/ Inquiry/Renewal		
Adjunct Faculty/Clinical/ Coordinator	$23,000 (.5 FTE)	
Other Staff Costs/ Released Time[d]	$6,000	
Stipends[e]	$6,900 (Leader) $23,000 (Summer)	$7,900 (Leader)
3. General & Indirect Costs		
Classroom Space[f]	N/A	N/A
Supplies	$2,000	$2,000
Travel	$4,000	$1,000
Technology	$1,500	$5,000
School District Administrative Costs	$5,300	
Secretarial Support	$2,250 (.15 FTE)	

TABLE 2 (CONT.)

Cost Item	Paid by School Dist.	Paid by Univ.[b]
University Administrative Costs		$3,590
Program Evaluation[c]	$500	$2,500
TOTAL OPERATING COSTS	**$108,050**	**$69,090**
Reimbursement Due School District	**[$33,600]**	**$33,600**
Costs to Institutions for Years 3+ (Year One and Year Two include $50,000 start-up costs/year—see page 18.)	**$74,450**	**$102,690**

NOTES TO TABLE 2:

* $33,600 in school expenditures are reimbursed to the school district by the university. Other costs relate to activities and are paid for out of operating budgets of paying institutions, unless otherwise noted. Some costs may be grant supported.

a. As explained on page 6, it is assumed that there will be $50,000 in start-up costs per year for two consecutive years. This table reflects expected expenditures in Year Three, Year Four, etc., excluding start-up costs. Start-up activities are not one-time expenditures. For example, there is a need for ongoing conversations about mission and for continuous re-examination of programs and procedures.

b. Reflects paying institution. Funds may come from the other partner, from grant sources, or from the regular operating budget.

c. Assume salary compensations of:

Regular Faculty = $46,000/year

Adjunct/Clinical/Coordinator = $46,000/year

Clerical/Secretarial = $15,000/year

NOTES TO TABLE 2 (CONT.):

d. Release of teachers for participation is made through: a) replacement by teacher education students; b) work done during summer; c) work done at end or beginning of school day; and d) replacement by substitutes (Substitute Rates = $100/day).

e. Stipend calculations (per diem set at .005):

1) District leadership: 1 person for 10 days curriculum leadership, 10 days workshop; 5 people participate for 2 days each for inquiry leadership (Total = 30 days @ $230/day)

2) University leadership: 1 person for 10 days curriculum, 20 days inquiry, plus two research grants of $500 each for university researchers

(Total = 30 days x $230/day + $1,000 grants)

3) Summer Institute (see page 8): 10 people x 10 days @ $230/day

f. Assume that at least one room is devoted to preservice and other PDS activities. It may be necessary to add capital costs associated with providing portable or other added classroom space. Some expense is provided for under start-up costs.

g. Program evaluation addresses progress being made with regard to all four purposes of the PDS (see page 3). This includes assessment of student progress in elementary school and preservice and inservice program. Work would be shared with other PDSes in same school-university partnership.

Northern's full teacher-training program also includes an 18-credit undergraduate minor and an M.Ed. completion phase—9 credits per year over two years after the portfolio review for admission. While the pre-certification fifth-year phase of the program uses a PDS as its main site, M.Ed. students complete their work in the schools in which they work as new teachers.

The four major components to the certification-year program occur primarily in a PDS.

1. **Admissions**. Prospective students, all of whom must hold a bachelor's degree, are first screened via paper review by university faculty to verify basic eligibility. Then, a portfolio review committee of school and university faculty examines the candidate's prior studies and experiences working with children. Prospective students next have an opportunity to visit those schools in the Bay School District which serve as PDSes for the Northern program. These orientation sessions provide a basis for them to decide in which setting they will seek placement. Candidates are then interviewed by a team of two school and one university faculty. Those who indicate that Bay is one of their preferred sites are interviewed by two educators from that school district along with the university faculty member who serves as the site leader. The final step in this phase is the placement process in which decisions are made that balance assignments among the different PDSes while honoring feedback from the interview teams and candidate requests.
2. **Team building**. University and school faculty working with Bay have selected an Outward Bound experience for their teacher education students. During the two- to three-day program, students and teachers develop self-confidence, establish reliance on each other, and begin to build themes for their work during the year. Various team-building activities, from rope courses to problem-solving simulations, are included. In addition to facilitation, travel, and housing costs associated with this experience, these efforts at team building are enhanced by attention to small details, such as the purchase of T-shirts for members of the Bay cohort.
3. **Curriculum and instruction**. Seven methods courses, totaling 21 credits, provide the background in pedagogy for the prospective teachers. Six of the courses focus on teaching mathematics, social studies, science, technology, and literacy (two courses comprise the literacy concentration—one in reading and one in writing). The seventh

course focuses on human development. For Northern, the schedule varies somewhat depending on the PDS. At Bay, the coursework begins in August and ends in February. The courses are usually taught at a Bay school by university faculty. A course leader from the Bay faculty sets up actual field assignments.

The internship is the second part of the curriculum and instruction component. It includes a year-long seminar for which students receive 3 credits in the fall and 3 credits in the spring. Additionally, students receive 6 credits for the 15-week internship they finish in the spring. Mentor teachers are assigned to the students at the beginning of the year and are compensated by Northern for work done throughout the year.

4. **Portfolio evaluation**. The mentor teacher and the university- and school-based site supervisors work with the student throughout the year to develop the portfolio. In the spring, the teacher education students make a public presentation of their work to their mentors, supervisors and to an outside person, such as Northern's dean, one of Bay's principals, or the district superintendent. Northern and Bay faculty recognize that this activity is a program-selling event as well an evaluative one.

During the course of one year, 15 interns are assigned to a Bay PDS for 33 credit hours each. Additionally, 15 undergraduate teacher education students also are assigned to a Bay PDS for one semester, each earning 3 credit hours. Thus, 540 total hours of credit are earned per year, 495 of which are graduate credits.

Bay serves as a professional development site as well as a location for clinical experiences for teacher education students.

Professional Development/Inquiry/School Renewal

Bay teachers take courses alongside of teacher education students in such subjects as math, science, and literacy. Teachers

pay through their district to attend these courses. The university obtains tuition for the equivalent of five full-time students from this source, generating 150 credit hours. Also, considerable efforts are made to assist teachers through the promotion of networking within schools and across schools within the school-university partnership in which Northern and Bay participate. The partnership also conducts conferences for teachers in the area—more than 500 educators engage annually in the discussions of different approaches to student assessment.

Work by school and university faculty to develop inquiry and research skills also aids in their professional growth. Investigation of using portfolios as a basis for certification is occurring at Bay and other PDSes associated with Northern. Work includes having Bay teachers actively participate in defining the parameters and requirements for preservice portfolios, including evaluating different approaches such as using videotape or digitized portfolios. Teachers assemble their own portfolios to help teacher candidates decide what to include.

Also, through the partnership between Northern and the school district, mini-grants are awarded to teachers to promote experimentation with new and innovative approaches to classroom assessment.

School renewal activities feature schools seeking to concentrate on learner-centered practice. One approach to this has been through promotion within the school-university partnership of the School Quality Review process. This process, based on concepts developed in another state and Great Britain, engages teachers throughout Bay School District, including some who are not particularly involved in preservice teacher education.

As another approach to school renewal, Bay faculty choose annual themes. With faculty from Northern University, they then build special courses and seminars around those themes for interns and cooperating teachers—e.g., on teacher portfolios, or integrated learning and articulation across grade levels.

TABLE 3

COSTS FOR BAY SCHOOL DISTRICT AND NORTHERN UNIVERSITY PDS[A]

Cost Item	Paid by School Dist.	Paid by Univ.
1. Preservice FT		
Regular Faculty	$34,500 (.75 FTE)	$65,320 (1.42 FTE)
Adjunct/Clinical/ Coordinator	$13,800 (.3 FTE)	$34,500 (.75 FTE)
Stipends/Awards	$6,345	$3,240
Clerical	$4,500 (.3 FTE)	$3,000 (.2 FTE)
Related Activities		
Travel		$3,500
Cohort Team-Building (w/faculty)	N/A	N/A
Admissions to PDS	$3,450	$690
Assessment of Candidates	$4,260	$575
2. Prof. Development/ Inquiry/Renewal		
Regular Lead Faculty	$241,500 (5.25 FTE)	$3,680 (.08 FTE)
Adjunct Faculty/Clinical/ Coordinator	$360,640 (7.84 FTE)	$1,380 (.03 FTE)
Teacher Release Time (160 x $100/day)	$16,000	
Stipends for Workshop Seminars	$30,000	$1,150
Teacher as Researcher Activities	$12,300	
School Effectiveness Evaluation	$10,000	
Curriculum Development	$19,500	

TABLE 3 (CONT.)

Cost Item	Paid by School Dist.	Paid by Univ.
3. General & Indirect Costs		
Supplies	$600	$600
Travel	$9,850	
Technology	$2,450	$2,500
School District Administrative Costs	$23,241	
University Administrative Costs		$4,307
Program Evaluation		$1,500
Ongoing Partnership Costs	$2,700	$12,000
TOTAL OPERATING COSTS	**$795,636**	**$137,942**
Reimbursement Due School District	**[$16,100]**	**$16,100**
Costs to Institutions for Years 3+ (Year One and Year Two include $50,000 start-up costs/year—see page 18.)	**$779,536****	**$154,042**

NOTES TO TABLE 3:

* $16,100 in school expenditures are reimbursed to the school district by the university.

** The real district used as primary reference point for Bay annually spends 4.5 percent of its district budget on staff development.

A wide variety of school renewal activities are facilitated by the school-university partnership in connection with various national reform movements, including Foxfire, Atlas, Coalition of Essential Schools, and the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools and Teaching (NCREST).

The university spends approximately $150,000 annually to provide 660 credit hours of instruction, most of which is post-graduate. This represents a cost of $6,819 per full-time equivalent student.

Table 3 reflects costs of a typical year at the Bay-Northern PDS, adjusted using assumed compensation rates that are the same as those used for the previous model.

Comparative Costs of Using and Not Using PDSes

The variance in costs of different teacher education and school renewal efforts is enormous. However, the data reviewed by the NNER study group confirm that, once start-up costs have been met, teacher education and school renewal functions at a PDS can be accomplished within existing levels of school district and university expenditure. Because effective PDSes require thorough planning and coordination between universities and schools, several, including Theobald (1991), have suggested that costs may increase by as much as 10 percent. However, the most critical factors in determining relative costs between traditional programs and PDSes appear to be (a) whether the PDS is implemented in place of other efforts at teacher education and school renewal, and (b) whether the university and the school districts both invest in the effort and commit to it as a critical component in teacher education and school renewal.

WHERE CAN MORE INFORMATION BE OBTAINED?

For more information about professional development schools, contact:

Richard W. Clark
Center for Educational Renewal
College of Education, 313 Miller Hall
Box 353600
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-3600

or

Institute for Educational Inquiry
124 E. Edgar Street
Seattle, WA 98102

(Note: These two organizations support the National Network for Educational Renewal, as referred to in Endnote 2.)

Ismat Abdal-Haqq
Coordinator
Clinical Schools Clearinghouse
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE)
One Dupont Circle, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-1186
Tel: 202/293-2450
Fax: 202/457-8095
E-mail: iah@aacte.nche.edu
Homepage: http://www.aacte.org

Marsha Levine
National Council for the Accreditation of
Teacher Education (NCATE)
2010 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036-1023
Tel: 202/466-7496
Fax: 202/296-6620
E-mail: ncate@ncate.org

Gary Griffin or Maritza MacDonald
National Center for Restructuring
Education, Schools and Teaching
Box 110
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, NY 10027
Tel: 212/678-4142

Publications on Professional Development Schools

Anderson, C.R., ed.(1993). *Voices of Change: A Report of the Clinical Schools Project.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Benedum Collaborative. (1996). "Professional Development Schools Teacher Assessment Study and Its Implications for School Renewal." (Unpublished Draft) Morgantown, WV: College of Human Resources and Education, West Virginia University.

Blocker, S. and C. Mantle-Bromley. "PDS vs. Campus Preparation: Through the Eyes of the Students." In press.

Butler, J.C. (December 1995). "A Special Report on the West Virginia University Education Reform Project." Prepared for the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation.

Clark, R. W. "Financing Professional Development Schools," *PDS Network News* (NCREST) 2 (spring 1995): 1-4,7.

— "Partner Schools." (1995). Seattle, WA: Center for Educational Renewal, College of Education, University of Washington.

— "Professional Development Schools," *Contemporary Education*, 4 (Summer 1996).

Contemporary Education (Vol. LXVII, No. 4, Summer 1996). Special Issue: "Professional Development Schools Revisited." Terre Haute, IN: School of Education, Indiana State University.

Cooner, D. D., S. Hilgemeier, G. Couger, and D. Adoue. (1996). "Texas A&M University Final Report, TEI Project: Professional Development School Partnerships at Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas." College Station, Texas: College of Education, Texas A&M University. (Unpublished—part of NEA's seven-site TEI Project)

Darling-Hammond, L., ed. (1994). *Professional Development Schools: Schools for Developing a Profession*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Frazier, C. M. (1993). *A Shared Vision: Policy Recommendations for Linking Teacher Education to School Reform*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Goodlad, John I. (1990). *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

— (1994). *Educational Renewal: Better Teachers, Better Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Holmes Group. *Tomorrow's Schools*. (1990). East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

— *Tomorrow's Schools of Education*. (1995). East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Levine, M., ed. (1992). *Professional Practice Schools: Linking Teacher Education and School Reform*. New York: Teachers College Press. (See particularly Barbara Neufeld, "Professional Practice Schools in Context: New Mixtures of Institutional Authority.")

Levine, M. and R. Trachtman. (1997). *Making Professional Development Schools Work: Policy, Politics, and Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

National Commission on Teaching & America's Future. (September 1996). *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future*. New York: NCTAF, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Osguthorpe, R. T., R. C. Harris, M. F. Harris, and S. Black, eds. (1995). *Partner Schools: Centers for Educational Renewal*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Petrie, H. G. (1995). *Professionalization, Partnership and Power: Building Professional Development Schools*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Theobald, N. "Staffing, Financing, and Governing Professional Development Schools." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 13 (Spring 1991): 87-101.

University of North Florida, Clay and Duval County Public Schools. (June 1996). "Final Report: Growing Young Minds, AT&T Teachers for Tomorrow Program." Jacksonville, FL: Author. Unpublished report on file at AACTE.

Webb-Dempsey, J. "Benedum Collaborative Professional Development Schools Impact Assessment Study: Initial Findings from Student Data Collection Pilot in the Five Original PDS Sites." (1996, draft report). Morgantown, WV: The Center for Renewal of Professional Preparation and Practice, College of Human Resources and Education, West Virginia University.

ENDNOTES

1. Wilson, Thomas A. "Resume Proper Attire: Setting Standards for Accreditation in an Unsettled Age," *NCATE Reporter* (June 1996).
2. See page 18 for a sample annual budget for developmental work, and pages 22-24 and 28-29 for two examples of reasonable expenditures for operating a PDS based on a survey of 18 professional development schools found primarily within the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER), an educational reform initiative embracing school-university partnerships in 14 states.
3. The 18 elementary schools whose data we examined tended to be smaller than Noble because a number of those who shared information with us were from rural areas. The number of preservice teachers interacting with a school during a semester ranged from 4 to 350. There were two which reported regular participation by approximately 30 students.
4. "District Averages." *Education Week*, 10 January 1996, p. 4.

CENTER FOR
EDUCATIONAL
RENEWAL

College of Education
University of Washington